

**California Tropical Forest Standard comments: ARB meeting Nov, 16 2018 Agenda 18-9-6**

**SLIDE ONE**

Hello my name is Gary Hughes and I have a few slides to go through quickly.

It is critical that directors do the necessary due diligence to inform any action, and one important element of due diligence in this instance is understanding the climate science that clearly describes the physical impossibility of forests compensating for fossil fuel emissions.

**SLIDE TWO**

Protecting forests is clearly an imperative. Many of us have been working to protect forests our entire lives, including fighting the very State of California as agencies facilitated the liquidation of the last old growth forests in the state. We cannot and will not allow the worlds remaining forests to be lost.

A fundamental to climate science that the ARB has failed to recognize is that emissions are cumulative. We have a limited carbon budget left to burn. TIME IS RUNNING OUT. We must protect forests AND keep fossil fuels in the ground.

**SLIDE THREE**

The toxic reality of how the California petrochemical industry has driven the destruction of the rainforest in the Western Amazon is also being ignored, even as many efforts have been made to bring the evidence of these impacts to your attention.

Obviously, if California is authentically concerned about tropical rainforests the state cannot continue turning a blind eye to the crude oil coming into the refinery sector from places like Ecuador and other tropical regions. Addressing the drivers of tropical deforestation cannot be delayed, yet this standard delays and distracts from doing just that.

**SLIDE FOUR**

Lastly, the international implications of this matter cannot be ignored. It is clearly stated by ARB that there is intent for this standard to be used by the global aviation industry for their emissions offsetting scheme. Note the graphic, describing the gross inequality in carbon impacts. Aviation transport is an activity of the global elite. More than half of the planet's population, that half whose climate impacts are absolutely minimal, will never see the inside of an airport much less step foot on an airplane. Yet these are the very people that live in the tropical forest regions in question, and who will be facing the adverse impacts of this policy.

The ethical implications of board members endorsing a policy when they are fully shielded from suffering the negative impacts of that policy are enormous. After all, it won't be any of you who suffer the pain of your university age child being disappeared in the night because of their courage in challenging the loggers who are in cahoots with the carbon traders. It is not your inlaws that will end up violently feuding because of the conflicts and controversies and social divisions that are a result of these policies. You are shielded from the consequences of this decision, but the ethical ramifications of endorsing this controversial policy cannot be ignored by directors, and are sufficient on their own to require rejection of endorsement of the standard.

Thank you.

**Gary Graham Hughes (garygrahamhughes@gmail.com/707-223-5434/@VozSilvestre)**

Carbon sequestration by the land sector essentially  
makes up for past deforestation  
- it does not "neutralize" our fossil fuel emissions.

Forest protection and restoration  
do not offset fossil fuel emissions  
as this can only be achieved  
through long term, slow  
geophysical processes of silicate  
weathering and deep ocean  
sedimentation.

## Do The Math

We have lost more than  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the world's forests

About 35% of the world's remaining old growth forests remain.

California is far behind this rate – <5% of California's old growth forests remain.

Protecting forests is an **IMPERATIVE!**

We must reduce emissions from all sources, and most especially not continue emissions from fossil fuels under the **erroneous assumption** that they can be offset by the world's forests.

Even if we returned ALL of the Earth's forests to their original primary forest condition (a fantasy) it would only "account" for ~one decade of current fossil fuel emissions.

**There is NO TIME LEFT to rely on offsets.**

## The Amazon and California: Crude Realities



## Extreme Global Carbon Inequality

Percentage of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by world population

